

Growth: The Journal of the Association for Christians in Student Development

Volume 9 | Number 9

Article 7

2010

Hooking Up

Kimberly C. Thornbury
Union University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pillars.taylor.edu/acsd_growth



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Thornbury, Kimberly C. (2010) "Hooking Up," *Growth: The Journal of the Association for Christians in Student Development*: Vol. 9 : No. 9 , Article 7.

Available at: https://pillars.taylor.edu/acsd_growth/vol9/iss9/7

This Review Essay is brought to you for free and open access by Pillars at Taylor University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Growth: The Journal of the Association for Christians in Student Development by an authorized editor of Pillars at Taylor University. For more information, please contact pillars@taylor.edu.

Hooking Up

A Review Essay by Kimberly C. Thornbury

This past year, the covers of three books sitting on the edge of my desk caught the eye of almost every student who visited with me. The first, Kathleen A. Bogle's *Hooking Up: Sex, Dating and Relationships on Campus*, displayed the back of a coed whose lilac bra was being opened by hands not her own. The second book, Laura Sessions Stepp's work, *Unhooked: How Young Women Pursue Sex, Delay Love and Lose Both*, shows a size 2 college female taking off her gray (probably Gap) long-sleeved shirt revealing the top of bra underneath. The bra was colored blush, but the girl's cheeks were probably not that hue. The third, *Sex & the Soul: Juggling Sexuality, Spirituality, Romance and Religion on America's College Campuses* by Donna Freitas, was a stark contrast, with two young adults in khaki pants and "mom would approve" modest sweaters holding their partners fingers as they walk along.

"Dean, what are you reading?!" the bravest asked me with a shy giggle and feigned shock. And just like the books described, most were eager to hear about my reading list and talk about their views on sex, campus behavior, and attitudes. These books provided honest snapshots of the current sexual climate on college campuses, updated definitions, and chilling personal accounts that could educate even those who may consider themselves "worldly wise."

I admit to loving the music of ABBA long before *Mama Mia* made it popular with my generation, but the stories in these books "flesh out" (no pun intended) lyrics such as "Gimme Gimme Gimme a man after midnight..." as it relates to this generation of college students.

This review summarizes the themes in each book, and also reiterates the applications and select suggestions these three authors offered in conclusion.

Laura Sessions Stepp's book *Unhooked: How Young Women Pursue Sex, Delay Love and Lose at Both* provides a fascinating and in-depth look at the causes and affects of the hooking up culture. Her compassionate interviews that dig deep into the personal histories of nine college women. As a result, they are compelling and insightful. Stepp deals seriously with the religious background of each person in the case study, but does not necessarily speak to the differences between secular and evangelical college climates per se as do the other two books.

Donna Freitas' work, *Sex & the Soul: Juggling Sexuality, Spirituality, Romance and Religion on America's College Campuses*, primarily explores the differences in attitudes towards sex and behaviors at Catholic, evangelical, non-religious, private and public universities. Her work began from teaching an overwhelmingly popular course on college dating that resulted in this national research project. This book should be a "must read" by every CCCU admissions team member and parent of a child in high school. It does more to market and promote the mission of evangelical colleges than most admissions materials! Freitas also mentions that her previous work in student affairs and working and living in residence life gave her the experience that helped guide her conversations with students.

In her work *“Hooking Up: Sex, Dating and Relationships on Campus,”* Kathleen A. Bogle transcribes a good deal of frank dialogue between her and students while attending both a large East Coast state university and smaller Roman Catholic university in the northeast (which Bogle calls “Faith U”). However, Freitas makes a strong argument in her book that the faith and behavior/attitudes towards sex on Catholic campuses are minimally different than secular private or state schools, and are in sharp contrast to her findings at evangelical schools. Therefore, Bogle’s term “Faith U” (used when referring to her subjects attending a Catholic university) should not be interpreted with the same lens as it would for evangelical institutions.

Hooking Up as Fast Food (or “Hooking Up” Defined)

Today’s college students do not automatically equate “hooking up” with sex. The term can mean kissing, vaginal intercourse, or anything in between with a partner to whom there are no expectations for future contact. In addition, students do not categorize oral sex as “sex” so again, students who claim not to have had sex typically mean anything short of vaginal intercourse. After all, today’s college freshman were only in early elementary school when President Clinton stated famously, “I did not have sexual relations with that woman...” only to discover post-facto the infamous stain. The Lewinsky affair reframed traditional definitions of sex for an entire generation.

Students hookup as quickly and effortlessly as they can become “unhooked,” so there is no need for the “DTR” (defining the relationship) conversation before or after the event. Stepp (2007), quoting guys about the definition of “hooking up,” explained it as “immediate gratification” and “fast food” (p. 21).

Hooking up typically will begin at parties or clubs, often with partners they may barely know through friends, someone they may have seen around campus or simply just met that night. However, many do not even necessarily have to “work that hard” (described as dressing up and heading out to a party) to begin hooking up. “Make out buddies” (a.k.a. friends with benefits) can enjoy subsequent passion following the sending of a simple text that says “wanna hang out?” More than 60% of teens admitted to having a “friends with benefits” relationship with “casual” hookups that are convenient for sure, and (on the surface) emotionally safe from long-term expectations.

Factors Contributing to a Culture of Hooking Up

The books explain major factors that have contributed to the culture of hooking up, including feminism, a longer span of time between puberty and marriage, and a time-strapped lifestyle coupled with high personal (or parental) expectations in many areas of the student’s life that make hooking up an easy short-term escape. Other factors include lax parents that hand their children over to universities that place little boundaries on co-curricular experimentation, and a continued strong cultural value on female physical attractiveness.

Stepp (2007) argues that movement towards the empowerment of women, feminism, is a logical backdrop to the hooking up culture. The frank discussions of female sexuality and encouragement to “have a sexual appetite and act on it” (p. 154) have given women the freedom to be more sexually aggressive and explore realms previously off limits to “proper” women. Such behaviors were fuel to changing the patriarchal grip on women. It is fair to say, however, that not all strategies were adopted or lauded by all leaders

within this movement. Freitas (2008) takes it a step further and clarifies that feminism per se is not the cause, but rather the “ongoing marginalization and trivialization of feminism by younger women and men” (p. 213).

Coupled with feminism, the youth culture of the 1960s “had come increasingly to value the expression of personal choice rather than conforming to adult expectations.” (Bogle, p. 22—but see footnote 61 as she quotes this from Modell, quoted in Arnett, 1998, 301). Today’s college women were being told from an early age that “they can go for what they want, and they should” (Stepp, 2007, p. 40). However, after they act like guys, “some girls are surprised by the emptiness they feel when there’s literally nobody new left to hookup with. Some are surprised when they discover that, having gotten sex, they want love, and they’re unsure of how to find it or, if they find it, how to handle it. Some are bewildered when the boy says he wants more than sex, or when he does the walking away. Hooking up leaves them unable to navigate in a world where their wants aren’t the only consideration” (Stepp, 2007, p. 66).

With an extended adolescence, both women and men have a lot more time to make these sexual choices. The time span between puberty to the average age of marriage is thirteen years. Bogle (2008) cites the average age a woman first marries is now 25, and for a man it’s 27. Perhaps they are waiting longer to get married due to pressures to succeed—there are grades to achieve before graduate school, graduate school itself, and long hours that must be put into the early stages of careers.

Research indicates that it is not entirely clear who is putting the pressure on these students to reach such high levels of achievement. Many are self-driven, but then again, parents have poured a lot of money in tuition and are hopeful their children can achieve career success worthy of their financial investment. A focus on a long-term relationship can distract from grades or career goals. Regardless of the source, pressure—the pressure to have good grades, volunteer or hold down a job, play sports, and participate in other co-curricular events takes a lot of time. Hooking up is so much easier—with no commitment or expectations, unlike other areas of their life. Stepp (2007) offers, “Girls hookup beginning in high school because it’s the only activity they can possibly manage and comes with no great expectations” (p. 236). Freitas (2008) echoes this argument. “Committed relationships can drain a person’s time, and most students just don’t have room (or don’t make room) in their schedules for hanging out regularly with a boyfriend or a girlfriend. So squeezing in no-strings-attached-sex after hours seems more efficient” (p. 134). All three authors noted the benefit of efficiency. Bogle agrees that young people don’t have time to date, leading us back to the attraction of having a “friend with benefits” in which all that is required for a hook-up is a quick facebook or text message.

The data shows that these sexual trends began while our students were in high school (or even junior high) where parents did not notice or set boundaries. Parents, and especially fathers, underestimate their role in their daughter’s lives. Says Stepp (2007), “Would they [fathers] do more if they knew that their daughters might drink less often, start dating later and begin sex later if they paid more attention? That’s what the research shows” (p. 45). Raising a teen takes some effort and it is not always easy to know what exact social circles your child is in, but Stepp (2007) reminds us that gone are the days of mom or dad picking up the phone and asking, “Who is it?” (p. 50). Even more archaic is an image of a landline phone ringing at the end of a “dorm hall” with all the girls on the floor peeking out of their rooms to see who the call is for, and from whom.

Standards relax even further when the 18-year-old enters the university. Administrators have moved away from an image of campus police. *In loco parentis* has been replaced at most colleges by a philosophy of *in loco grandparents* where the kids come, do what they want, and the school will just clean up afterwards. Stepp (2007) describes “College authorities, at one time surrogate parents, have become absentee landlords. Rules that both inhibited and protected students are gone” (p. 16). Co-ed floors and bathrooms, ineffective policies and programs to curb underage drinking, and offensive themed parties or sex-studded date auctions that continue as annual traditions are few examples of college leadership’s “hands off” approach on many campuses.

Bogle’s (2008) book also notes that the high value placed on a woman’s looks (as defined by the ability to be physically attractive to others) lends itself to this hookup culture. “For women, physical appearance plays a more central role in attracting the opposite sex than it does for men. Similarly, anthropologists Dorothy Holland and Margaret Eisenhart found, in their study of two southern universities in the early 1980s, that a woman’s status on campus was determined almost exclusively by her perceived level of physical attractiveness around men. Men’s status, on the other hand, derived from many different sources (e.g. fraternity membership, athletic status, academic major, intellectual ability.) Therefore, college men were valued for many attributes, while women had to rely solely on their looks” (p.33). And since women make up 58% of the college population, Freitas (2008) notes that women have to both be sexy and work hard to meet the high standard of effortless perfection (p. 148).

The need for confirmation and affirmation of one’s good looks brings other consequences besides hooking up. Bogle (2008) writes of a female coed quoting an oft-heard message about her particular campus, “[This college] gives out more eating disorders than diplomas” (p. 72). As a mother of two daughters (ages 6 and 8), I see firsthand the pressure towards this sexualization. Not only am I not interested in thongs for my 8-year-old or panties for my first grader that read “juicy” on the bumper, I am angry that such merchandise is available and marketed to my girls and their peers.

More Factors, and Consequences

Raunchy theme parties, vocabulary such as “sexting and “sexiled,” and a new model for dating were three other examples I found compelling in the books. I am not sure if I would categorize them as factors that contributed to widespread “hookups” or consequences as a result of this hookup culture.

Each author described disturbing popular themed parties on (non-evangelical campuses) such as “CEO’s and Office Ho’s” and “Millionaires and Maids” where pornography seen on the computer screen is played out in real life. Freitas (2008) explains, “instead of simply watching porn, college men get to re-create these fantasies live among women with whom they go to class” (p. 145). The parties are obviously disturbing on so many levels even beyond women willingly walking across a snow-covered campus in lingerie to a party with the expectation they’ll hookup by the end of the night.) For women who grew up with Britney Spears, Christina Aguilera, the OC, and read *Cosmo* (The #1 magazine among college age women), they know the dance moves and outfits to wear to these parties. Stripper pole optional.

Freitas (2008) offers this questions for prospective parents: “An institution can have all the prestige in the world, offer the best education and impressive swath of majors,

and even have a great basketball team—but what if this same place has your daughter dressing up as a “secretary ho” on Friday night?” (p. 23).

In September 2007, when our current freshman class were juniors in high school, “news broke that nude photos of Disney’s “High School Musical” star Vanessa Hudgens surfaced on the Internet. The photos were alleged to be self-portraits taken with Hudgens’ cellphone and sent to her boyfriend, co-star Zac Efron.” <http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/nationworld/2008845> The term is known as “sexting” and provides another example of increasingly willing females to showcase for men.

The term “Sexiled” is another common university term that means being exiled from your room so your roommate can finish hooking up. Yes, older movies have shown the proverbial “red rope” on the outside doorknob of a college dorm. College students having sex is not new or surprising. But the word “sexiled” entering common collegiate vocabulary represents a new trend. Unlike past generations, the college roommate mercifully need only wait out in the hallway a half hour. Hookups are recreational and sleeping over makes things awkward for both parties.

It is clear the model has changed. The “old model” dictated dating until one found someone of mutual interest. By slowing learning about each other’s interests, the couple would build a relationship in which a physical relationship may eventually ensue. The new model is widespread and seems to make sense to many college students: Hookup first and (maybe) see if there is potential for a longer-term relationship there. Obviously, hookups are not borne out of a desire for a long-term relationships, but if one is curious about companionships, “hooking up” is where many seem to “start” to find it.

Social Norms

Hooking up is now a social norm, meaning that there is a perception among youths that most others are doing it. Studies show that the perception of the percentage of peers engaging in behavior such as sex acts, drinking, and drug use is actually higher than the actual statistics of those really engaging in those behaviors. However, college students are not far off on their views that sexual activity is indeed quite widespread. Laura Sessions Stepp (2007) used an independent organization called Child Trends to help her make “sense of the most reliable large-scale studies” and determined 75% of male and females (yes, equal percentages) ages 18-22 reported having sex (p. 9). Freitas (2008) quotes a figure that 73%-85% of college students are sexually active (Freitas, quoting from Christian Smith’s *Soul Searching*, p.254). Stepp (2007) explains the timeline. “By college, more of them are engaging in intercourse—nine out of ten by senior year compared with six of ten by senior year in high school” (p.220).

More shockingly, according to national data released in mid-2005, one out of every two teenagers between 15 and 19 has given or received oral sex. In the CDC sample, “teens from white, middle- and upper-income families... were more likely to have engaged in oral sex than other groups” (Stepp, 2007, p. 75). This may be the time to remind the reader that although the abortion rate has dropped, the United States STD rate is consistently high, “higher, in fact, in the United States than in any other developed country” (Stepp, 2007, p. 236).

The high percent of sexually active teens puts the college virgin clearly in the minority at most campuses. At non-evangelical schools, “being a virgin is a sign that something is wrong with you, rather than something valuable” (Frietas, 2008, p. 132). Many women

at non-evangelical campuses in the book describe losing their virginity not in warm, romantic tones but rather as “getting it over with” (Freitas, 2008, p. 133). Drop off dry cleaning: check; Arts and Western Civilization: check; lose virginity: check, “I heard from a lot of women and men who decided one night to rid themselves of this stigma, this ‘mark’ [as one interview regarded it] that kept them from being normal adults having a ‘normal’ college life” (Freitas, 2008, p. 134).

Role of Alcohol

The use of alcohol served as a dominant theme in each book. “Of the hundreds of young women I interviewed about hookup experiences, less than a half-dozen said they were sober at the time” (Stepp, 2007, p. 122). One of the more disturbing accounts in the books was a section by Stepp (2007) as she explained the phenomenon of coeds taking pictures of each other after “last call” at the bar was announced. Students would take photos of each other, enter cell numbers and post the day of the week into the contact information. As she inquired about this trend, a medical student explained, “We need the pictures so we can remember who we were with the night before” (p. 124). [It’s noted that these students need only to remember who they were with if the partner happens to call after the encounter.]

“Gray rape” is an emerging term used by defense lawyers to describe situations where a woman has sex despite her wishes, but because she was drunk or wore a certain outfit or even initiated the hookup (with no intention of actual intercourse) the responsibility lies (at least in part) with her. Many women who clearly voiced that they did not want to have sex, but were drunk enough to forget all the details of the evening, do not report rapes or feel worthy of reporting the crime (Stepp, 2007, p. 248). Again, alcohol was a common theme or precursor to hooking up.

Effects

For all the casual talk about hooking up, the authors’ narrative indicates that most women do not like ongoing hookups and the effects. From tainted reputations to major depression, the ongoing encounters are rarely without consequence. Many express anxiety over this practice, and admit to shame, fear, and regret. Although they are pressured to separate sexual activity from romance, it can be challenging for most women. “Reconciling sex and the soul is not only extremely difficult for them, but rare” (Freitas, 2008, p. 216).

Contrary to stereotypical images, not all men embraced this sexual freedom. Many were eager to find another, better model for relationships, but did not know how to return to romance. “You don’t know how to do things differently once you realize you want more” (Stepp, 2007, p. 173). Further, “Surprisingly little research has been done on what kinds of relationships lead to good marriages. But the traits that characterize good marriages are firmly established and include trust, respect, admiration, honesty, selflessness, communication, caring and, perhaps more than anything else, commitment. Hookups are about anything but these qualities. It’s as if young women are practicing sprints while planning to run a marathon” (Stepp, 2007, p. 253). The marathon is a metaphor for long-term relationships, if not marriage. Marriage was not seen as an end goal for many women who have seen four sexy women in NYC make it through life with their “urban tribe” rather than a consistent lifelong partner. Laura Sessions Stepp

(2007) found that “while two out of three young men said it was better to get married than go through life single, fewer than half of the young women felt that way” (p. 9).

By definition the hookup is designed with little to no future expectations of the partner. While women know this technically, their hearts may not have gotten the message. The fact is, the shorter the hookup, the more likely depression will show up (Stepp, 2007, p. 241). In the book *College of the Overwhelmed*, author Richard Kadison reveals that “for every five young people who reach 24, one will have been diagnosed with major depression” (Stepp, 2007, p.242). Obviously the causes for such deep depression are certainly varied, but it is true that a lifestyle of short-term sexual encounters leads to depression in many women.

The Evangelical Difference

Freitas’ work clearly explains how overall behaviors and attitudes are significantly different at evangelical colleges as compared to their secular or Catholic institutions. In my heart, I initially opened the pages with despair, expecting to find little to no difference in sexual behavior between campuses. To my pleasant surprise, the difference was stark and hopeful. “The only exception I found to hookup culture was at America’s evangelical colleges” (Freitas, 2008, p. 14). Freitas (2008) describes evangelical colleges as “religiously infused” with a “quest for purity and chastity [that] reigns supreme on these campuses” (p. 14).

Not only was Freitas positive about her findings of sexual restraint, but also her observations of the entire campus culture are noteworthy. “Walking onto the campus of an evangelical college for the first time was like entering a world almost entirely apart from the other schools I visited. At these institutions, faith is neither ignored nor suppressed. In fact, at these schools, faith is everything. It is the bedrock on which both the curriculum and the social life are built, and where religion is not only powerful, it is public” (Freitas, 2008, p. 62). In addition, she observed with enthusiasm the diversity of thought, backgrounds, career goals, geography and other demographics of these students. The author continues, “there is nearly as much diversity inside evangelical culture as there is outside of it. And time after time during my interviews, these [negative] stereotypes were shattered” (Freitas, 2008, p. 62).

The following summary from Freitas’ work should encourage those of you working in evangelical institutions and may capture the work you do each day on your campus.

Catholic, nonreligious private, and public colleges and universities — what I call the spiritual colleges—stand to learn something from their evangelical counterparts; evangelical colleges are interesting models for the kind of mentoring communities that Sharon Daloz Parks advocates in *Big Questions, Worthy Dreams: Mentoring Young Adults in Their Search for Meaning, Purpose and Faith*. To create a community where faith matters not just in theory but in reality, faith has to be a public value, not a private one. Professors need to embrace the idea of themselves as “spiritual guides” of sort and their syllabi as “confessions of faith.” The campus should be a culture forged by a shared identity, mission, and values of its own, each forming a sense of itself as something special and set apart from the broader culture (and that does not trade solely on its sports teams for these dimensions).

The only institutions at which I encountered a shared identity and common values—which I now believe are keys to a healthy college experience, especially when it comes to reigning in hookup culture—were the two evangelical schools (p. 67).

One of the reasons for the strong sense of community at these evangelical campuses is the positive effect of the “sacred canopy,” a term coined by Peter Berger (Freitas, 2008, p. 14). For someone who hears about our intuition’s “bubble” from students, I may ask our students to use the rich term “sacred canopy” instead and embrace the shared vision, environment of mentoring, and exploration of ideas and thoughts with Christ-centered intellectuals.

Evangelical Challenges

Despite her affirmation of her experiences at evangelical colleges, Freitas does not shy away from some of the challenges she saw for these women. Sometimes a pressure for that “Mrs.” Degree can be challenging when women must be passive and men may be slow to take leadership in relationships. On evangelical campuses, many guys don’t ask girl on a date because in that culture, the relationship automatically is viewed as serious. (Many ACSD campuses share the joke that if a new couple is seen together at Wal-Mart, engagement must be right around the corner.) Freitas talks about a solution coined “frugaling.” She defines it as something in between dating and non-dating on the evangelical campus. It happens when a guy and girl get to know each other in a group setting, and then are, over time, seen talking together one-on-one in public without ever having the DTR (defining the relationship) talk. She also explains the dating rituals at evangelical colleges with precision, which include “Campus walks” (“which can start out as frugaling”) (Freitas, 2008, p. 116). The term one may hear is NCMO, or the “non-committal make out” at evangelical colleges (Freitas 2008, p. 119). Perhaps that term sounds more restrained than “hooking up.” Other challenges include the value of getting a “ring by spring” which seemed to cause real anxiety and fear for many senior women whose prospects did not include engagement.

Freitas captures the purity ideal on evangelical campuses, and the rings, books, speakers and techniques used to wage battle against sexual temptation and remain “heroic virgins.” Her interviews with those who have failed to remain sexually pure are insightful, both with those who choose to remain sexually active and others who become “born again virgins” —those recommitting themselves to now remain chaste until marriage. She also talks with the rare “sexually active seeker” those who continue in sexual activity but are still desire a growing spirituality.

Sex on evangelical campuses is seen as a battle between faith and sex (where seemingly one will win out at the end). At non-evangelical campuses, the students tended not to feel such conflict, as issues of sexuality and faith are compartmentalized and isolated, and faith can have little influence over sexual behavior.

Despite this strong battle for both men and women, there is promised light at the end of the tunnel. “Although evangelical college students have quite a battle ahead of them prior to marriage, they do occasionally discuss the wild sex lives they expect to have (and are promised they will have) once they make it to the altar” (Freitas, 2008, p. 197).

Understanding the challenges of the battle and the emotions of students who have “lost the battle” are discussed at length in Freitas’ work.

What Your Students Need to Know

Freitas explains a longing for boundaries among students at colleges. I felt bolstered by the fact that our expectations of students’ behavior, positively affect campus culture. Despite complaints about restricted “open visitation” policies and strong limits on alcohol, such standards do seem to provide an external force (at least someone else to blame) to help students avoid tempting situations. Stepp (2007) explains, “for adolescents thinking about having sex, opportunity matters—a lot” (Stepp, p. 216).

The students interviewed in these books shared a desire to bring back romance (which most often was described by the students as “talking for hours” with their romantic partner, but less knowledge about how to bring this about or sustain this (or even develop healthy relationships). Sex weeks on campus with “tents of consent” are not as helpful to these students as honest, ongoing conversations about dating and relationships. Freitas’ work, as I mentioned previously, emerged from a class she taught on dating. She was nervous no one would take the class initially, and surprised when it filled up within minutes with non-registered students begging to be let in. In her book, Stepp mentions a handful of colleges that offer such relationship courses, but notes that dating and relationship classes are not widespread (possibly due to the perceived “softness” of the course material and the potential judgement from fellow academic colleagues).

Many of our campuses have avenues for such discussion, for example chapel, spiritual formation classes, residence life programming, book readings with professors, lecture series, and informal mentoring relationships that build trust and ask deep questions about sexuality and relationships.

If parents have not provided good models or conversation partners about sex and intimacy, students will still yearn for advice elsewhere. “[Parents] do what they feel comfortable doing: help a maturing child devise a budget, furnish an apartment, maybe find a first job. Giving advice about emotional intimacy is something else, particularly if their own experiences have been less than perfect. As a result, kids grow up depending on parents for help with everything except what may be life’s most fundamental need: to love and be loved by a life partner” (Stepp, 2007, p. 193). Watching *He’s Just Not That Into You* to learn how to negotiate relationships is best tempered with some ongoing conversations about Biblical intimacy. Student Development professionals can take the lead in these conversations. “There’s a thick wall between the classroom and everything else. Brilliant students may hone sophisticated reasoning abilities in their courses, but they don’t know seem inclined to take those abilities with them once class ends. They either don’t know how or haven’t been offered the tools to apply what they learn to their personal lives” (Freitas, 2008, p. 224).

Laura Sessions Stepp (2007), reflecting on her interviews, asked “Who was reminding them that sex, in any form, is more powerful when you don’t throw it around, more satisfying when it’s savored with someone you love? Who was asking them to think seriously about their goals for happiness beyond the law degree or to consider that having sex with lots of men might limit their ability to conceive children? Who was helping them see that loving relationships are uniquely satisfying and manageable and

need not tie them down for the rest of their lives?” (p. 7). The rhetorical answer was of course that perhaps the university might reconsider their role in helping students discuss and work through these huge questions.

Freitas’ book especially can energize even the weariest of student development professionals. She writes how issues of faith are private and personal, and not explored publically at non-evangelical schools. Her interviews of faith led her to conclude, “if a college does not intentionally cultivate and invite personal, religious expression, students end up navigating a campus atmosphere that makes faith talk awkward, and even unwelcome, and the so-called benefit of this diversity [is] lost in students’ real experiences” (Freitas, 2008, p. 33). Our work is to not only welcome discussions of faith but also link arms with faculty to create an entire campus where all of these issues are purposefully discussed to the Glory of God. The books have bolstered my sense of mission (and not just in the area of “hooking up”) but in all our efforts to provide non-compartmentalized worldview models and guidance for our students.

Kimberly C. Thornbury serves as the Vice President for Student Services and Dean of Students at Union University in Jackson, TN

References

- Bogle, K. (2008). *Hooking up: Sex, dating and relationships on campus*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Freitas, D. (2008). *Sex and the soul: Juggling sexuality, spirituality, romance, and religion on America’s college campus*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Stepp, S. S. (2007). *Unhooked: How young women pursue sex, delay love, and lose at both*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.